APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/677,993	10/03/2000	Curt J. Witte	9201-3	5689

20792	7590	08/09/2006

MYERS BIGEL SIBLEY & SAJOVEC
PO BOX 37428
RALEIGH, NC 27627

EXAMINER
MEINECKE DIAZ, SUSANNA M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3623	

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/677,993	WITTE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Susanna M. Diaz	3623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 July 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-14,16-23,25,26,28-39,41-48,50-61 and 63-67* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-7,10-14,16-23,25,26,28-32,35-39,41-48,50-54,57-61 and 63-67* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *8,9,33,34,55 and 56* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This final action is responsive to Applicant's response filed July 21, 2006.

No claims have been amended.

Claims 1, 3-14, 16-23, 25, 26, 28-39, 41-48, 50-61, and 63-67 are presented for

examination.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed July 21, 2006 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

Applicant argues that there is no motivation to combine the cited references.

More specifically, Applicant submits that "none of the cited references include any clear

and particular evidence of why it would be desirable to use an inference engine for

ranking job post sites...Applicants can find no disclosure in either Callan or Qureshi that

suggest it may be desirable to use an expert system to address the problem of selecting

a job post site from among a plurality of job post site candidates." (Page 25 of

Applicant's response) The Examiner respectfully disagrees. As explained in the art

rejection, it is clear that Webhire must use some established methodology for

successfully performing the disclosed task of ranking job post sites. The Examiner

submits that there were various approaches to ranking search results by relevance at

the time of Applicant's invention. For example, Callan discusses the use of inference

networks (which inherently utilize inference engines) to rank document collections

based on the relevance of the documents to a given query (Callan: ¶¶ 1, 14-21). The

Examiner submits that inference networks/engines require use of a fact table, such as a knowledge or experience base, in order to make decisions. This assertion is supported in ¶¶ 6 and 10 of Qureshi. Qureshi also explains several benefits of expert systems, such as those incorporating inference engines. These benefits include: consistency and reliability, completeness and timeliness in reviewing transactions, quicker decision making than human experts, greater security than an expert employee who may leave the company for a competitor, capture and documentation of scarce expertise, etc. (Qureshi: ¶ 38). Since Webhire must use some methodology for ranking its job post sites and the use of inference engines (in combination with a knowledge/experience base, i.e., a fact table) to rank document results based on relevance to a specified query is old and well-known (as taught by Callan and Qureshi), the Examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify Webhire to access a fact table that contains data relevant to the at least one job post site selection criterion and use an inference engine to process the at least one job post site selection criterion and the fact table to rank the plurality of job post sites based on the at least one job post site selection criterion in order to reap the benefits of inference engines, including consistency and reliability, completeness and timeliness in reviewing transactions, quicker decision making than human experts, greater security than an expert employee who may leave the company for a competitor, capture and documentation of scarce expertise, etc. (as taught by Qureshi: ¶ 38).

Callan and Qureshi disclose search methodologies that can be applied to searching documents of any type of subject matter. From the standpoint of the Callan and Qureshi references, the particular type of subject matter of the searched documents amounts to nothing more than mere intended use and non-functional, descriptive data. Therefore, the Examiner maintains that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention would have indeed been motivated to combine the teachings of the cited references for the reasons set forth in the art rejection.

Also, Examiner notes that, as per MPEP § 2144.03(C), the statements of Official Notice made in the art rejection have been established as admitted prior art since Applicant has not traversed the Examiner's assertions of Official Notice. More specifically, the following statements of Official Notice are now formally established on record as admitted prior art:

Official Notice is taken that it is old and well-known in the art of web-based programming to encode web sites that pull information from databases using XML since XML provides the benefit of more efficient dynamic content management.

Official Notice is taken that it is old and well-known in the art of database management to run searches off of a parsed query.

In conclusion, Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1, 3-7, 10-14, 16-23, 25, 26, 28-32, 35-39, 41-48, 50-54, 57-61, and 63-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Webhire (as disclosed in "Webhire Links Corporate Recruiting Desktops to Over 2,000 Job Posting Sites") in view of Callan et al. ("Searching Distributed Collections With Inference Networks") and further in view of Qureshi et al. ("Artificial Intelligence in Accounting and Business").

Webhire discloses a method of selecting a job post site, comprising:

[Claim 1]   obtaining at least one job post site selection criterion (Webhire: ¶ 6 – "Corporate recruiters indicate the type of position they are filling, for example, engineering or accounting, and quickly receive an online listing of the specific job sites within the service that are most likely to attract qualified candidates for those specific openings");

automatically ranking a plurality of job post sites based on the at least one job post site selection criterion (Webhire: ¶¶ 2, 6 – "...quickly receive an online listing of the specific job sites within the service that are most likely to attract qualified candidates for those specific openings." By identifying the best web sites, it is understood that the best web sites are ranked more highly than other existing job posting sites);

selecting the job post site from the plurality of job post sites based on the ranking of the plurality of job post sites (Webhire: ¶ 5 – "Using Webhire's integrated job posting,

corporate recruiters enter a job description once, and with just a few mouse clicks, send

that job to any or all of the over two thousand recruiting destinations now available");

[Claim 3]   wherein obtaining the at least one job post site selection criterion

comprises:

obtaining a geographic location criterion (Webhire: ¶ 6 – "Job site searches can

also be targeted regionally");

obtaining a skill set criterion (Webhire: ¶ 6 – "Corporate recruiters indicate the

type of position they are filling, for example, engineering or accounting, and quickly

receive an online listing of the specific job sites within the service that are most likely to

attract qualified candidates for those specific openings." A specific job position is

understood to require a particular skill set criterion); and

obtaining a job post site performance criterion that is indicative of a value of a job

post site in acting as a source for candidates (Webhire: ¶ 6 – "Corporate recruiters

indicate the type of position they are filling, for example, engineering or accounting, and

quickly receive an online listing of the specific job sites within the service that are most

likely to attract qualified candidates for those specific openings. Job site searches can

also be targeted regionally or focused on specific attributes, such as diversity

candidates or college graduates");

[Claim 4]   wherein automatically ranking the plurality of job post sites based on the at

least one job post site selection criterion comprises:

identifying job post sites of the plurality of job post sites that satisfy the

geographic location criterion (Webhire: ¶¶ 2, 5, 6);

ranking the identified job post sites that satisfy the geographic location criterion

based on the job post site performance criterion to generate a geographic location and

job post site performance ranked list of job post sites (Webhire: ¶¶ 2, 5, 6);

identifying job post sites of the plurality of job post sites that satisfy the skill set

criterion (Webhire: ¶¶ 2, 5, 6); and

ranking the identified job post sites that satisfy the skill set criterion based on the

job post site performance criterion to generate a skill set and job post site performance

ranked list of job post sites (Webhire: ¶¶ 2, 5, 6).

Regarding claim 1, Webhire does not expressly disclose how the job post sites

are ranked; however, it is clear that Webhire must use some established methodology

for successfully performing such a task. The Examiner submits that there were various

approaches to ranking search results by relevance at the time of Applicant's invention.

For example, Callan discusses the use of inference networks (which inherently utilize

inference engines) to rank document collections based on the relevance of the

documents to a given query (Callan: ¶¶ 1, 14-21). The Examiner submits that inference

networks/engines require use of a fact table, such as a knowledge or experience base,

in order to make decisions. This assertion is supported in ¶¶ 6 and 10 of Qureshi.

Qureshi also explains several benefits of expert systems, such as those incorporating

inference engines. These benefits include: consistency and reliability, completeness

and timeliness in reviewing transactions, quicker decision making than human experts,

greater security than an expert employee who may leave the company for a competitor,

capture and documentation of scarce expertise, etc. (Qureshi: ¶ 38). Since Webhire must use some methodology for ranking its job post sites and the use of inference engines (in combination with a knowledge/experience base, i.e., a fact table) to rank document results based on relevance to a specified query is old and well-known (as taught by Callan and Qureshi), the Examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify Webhire to access a fact table that contains data relevant to the at least one job post site selection criterion and use an inference engine to process the at least one job post site selection criterion and the fact table to rank the plurality of job post sites based on the at least one job post site selection criterion in order to reap the benefits of inference engines, including consistency and reliability, completeness and timeliness in reviewing transactions, quicker decision making than human experts, greater security than an expert employee who may leave the company for a competitor, capture and documentation of scarce expertise, etc. (as taught by Qureshi: ¶ 38).

Regarding claims 5-7, the Webhire-Callan-Qureshi combination discussed above addresses a modified version of Webhire that effectively uses an inference engine to rank job post sites based on a query specifying geographic location, skill set, and job post site performance criteria. Claims 5-7 are directed toward the details of looking up geographic location, skill set, and job post site performance criteria in a fact table, which has already been addressed by the Webhire-Callan-Qureshi combination; therefore, the limitations of claims 5-7 are similarly deemed to be addressed by the rejection of claims 1, 3, and 4 above.

Webhire discloses a method for posting a job opening description, comprising:

[Claim 10]   obtaining at least one job post site selection criterion (Webhire: ¶ 6 –

"Corporate recruiters indicate the type of position they are filling, for example,

engineering or accounting, and quickly receive an online listing of the specific job sites

within the service that are most likely to attract qualified candidates for those specific

openings");

automatically ranking a plurality of job post sites based on the at least one job

post site selection criterion (Webhire: ¶¶ 2, 6 – "…quickly receive an online listing of the

specific job sites within the service that are most likely to attract qualified candidates for

those specific openings." By identifying the best web sites, it is understood that the best

web sites are ranked more highly than other existing job posting sites);

selecting the job post site from the plurality of job post sites based on the ranking

of the plurality of job post sites (Webhire: ¶ 5 – "Using Webhire's integrated job posting,

corporate recruiters enter a job description once, and with just a few mouse clicks, send

that job to any or all of the over two thousand recruiting destinations now available");

posting the job opening description to the selected at least one job post site

(Webhire: ¶ 5 – "Using Webhire's integrated job posting, corporate recruiters enter a job

description once, and with just a few mouse clicks, send that job to any or all of the over

two thousand recruiting destinations now available");

[Claim 12]   wherein selecting the at least one job post site from the plurality of job

post sites based on the ranking of the plurality of job post sites comprising:

displaying the ranked plurality of job post sites to an end user (Webhire: ¶¶ 2, 5, 6); and

obtaining user input to select the at least one job post site from the ranked plurality of job post sites from the end user (Webhire: ¶¶ 2, 5, 6);

[Claim 13]   wherein selecting the at least one job post site from the plurality of job post sites based on the ranking of the plurality of job post sites comprises:

selecting the at least one job post site from the plurality of job post sites based on the ranking of the plurality of job post sites independent of user input (Webhire: ¶¶ 2, 5, 6);

[Claim 14]   wherein posting the job opening description to the selected at least one job post site comprises:

converting the job opening description into a format compatible with the selected at least one job post site (Webhire: ¶¶ 2, 5, 6 -- Conversion of data into a proper format for a given website is inherent to Internet communications); and

sending the converted job opening description to the at least one job post site (Webhire: ¶¶ 2, 5, 6);

[Claim 16]   obtaining a job post site performance criterion that is indicative of a value of a job post site in acting as a source for candidates (Webhire: ¶¶ 2, 5, 6); and

wherein the at least one job post site selection criterion comprises:

a geographic location criterion (Webhire: ¶¶ 2, 5, 6); and

a skill set criterion (Webhire: ¶¶ 2, 5, 6);

[Claim 17]   wherein ranking the plurality of job post sites based on the at least one job post site selection criterion comprises:

identifying job post sites of the plurality of job post sites that satisfy the geographic location criterion (Webhire: ¶¶ 2, 5, 6);

automatically ranking the identified job post sites that satisfy the geographic location criterion based on the job post site performance criterion to generate a geographic location and job post site performance ranked list of job post sites (Webhire: ¶¶ 2, 5, 6);

identifying job post sites of the plurality of job post sites that satisfy the skill set criterion (Webhire: ¶¶ 2, 5, 6); and

automatically ranking the identified job post sites that satisfy the skill set criterion based on the job post site performance criterion to generate a skill set and job post site performance ranked list of job post sites (Webhire: ¶¶ 2, 5, 6);

[Claim 18]   automatically ranking the geographic location and job post site performance ranked list of job post sites with the skill set and job post site performance ranked list of job post sites to generate a geographic location, skill set, and job post site performance ranked list of job post sites (Webhire: ¶¶ 2, 5, 6);

[Claim 19]   wherein selecting the at least one job post site from the plurality of job post sites based on the ranking of the plurality of job post sites comprises:

selecting the job post sites in the geographic location, skill set, and job post site performance ranked list of job post sites (Webhire: ¶¶ 2, 5, 6);

[Claim 20]   wherein posting the job opening description to the selected at least one

job post site comprises:

converting the job opening description into a respective format compatible with a

respective one of the job post sites in the geographic location, skill set, and job post site

performance ranked list of job post sites (Webhire: ¶¶ 2, 5, 6 -- Conversion of data into

a proper format for a given website is inherent to Internet communications); and

sending the respective converted job opening description to the respective one of

the job post sites in the geographic location, skill set, and job post site performance

ranked list of job post sites (Webhire: ¶¶ 2, 5, 6 -- Conversion of data into a proper

format for a given website is inherent to Internet communications);

[Claim 21]   wherein selecting the at least one job post site from the plurality of job

post sites based on the ranking of the plurality of job post sites comprises:

displaying the geographic location, skill set, and job post site performance ranked

list of job post sites to an end user (Webhire: ¶¶ 2, 5, 6); and

obtaining user input to select the at least one job post site from the geographic

location, skill set, and job post site performance ranked list of job post sites from the end

user (Webhire: ¶¶ 2, 5, 6);

[Claim 22]   wherein posting the job opening description to the selected at least one

job post site comprises:

converting the job opening description into a format compatible with the at least

one job post site from the geographic location, skill set, and job post site performance

ranked list of job post sites obtained from the end user (Webhire: ¶¶ 2, 5, 6 --

Conversion of data into a proper format for a given website is inherent to Internet

communications); and

sending the converted job opening description to the at least one job post site

from the geographic location, skill set, and job post site performance ranked list of job

post sites obtained from the end user (Webhire: ¶¶ 2, 5, 6).

Regarding claim 10, Webhire does not expressly disclose how the job post sites

are ranked; however, it is clear that Webhire must use some established methodology

for successfully performing such a task. The Examiner submits that there were various

approaches to ranking search results by relevance at the time of Applicant's invention.

For example, Callan discusses the use of inference networks (which inherently utilize

inference engines) to rank document collections based on the relevance of the

documents to a given query (Callan: ¶¶ 1, 14-21). The Examiner submits that inference

networks/engines require use of a fact table, such as a knowledge or experience base,

in order to make decisions. This assertion is supported in ¶¶ 6 and 10 of Qureshi.

Qureshi also explains several benefits of expert systems, such as those incorporating

inference engines. These benefits include: consistency and reliability, completeness

and timeliness in reviewing transactions, quicker decision making than human experts,

greater security than an expert employee who may leave the company for a competitor,

capture and documentation of scarce expertise, etc. (Qureshi: ¶ 38). Since Webhire

must use some methodology for ranking its job post sites and the use of inference

engines (in combination with a knowledge/experience base, i.e., a fact table) to rank

document results based on relevance to a specified query is old and well-known (as taught by Callan and Qureshi), the Examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify Webhire to access a fact table that contains data relevant to the at least one job post site selection criterion and use an inference engine to process the at least one job post site selection criterion and the fact table to rank the plurality of job post sites based on the at least one job post site selection criterion in order to reap the benefits of inference engines, including consistency and reliability, completeness and timeliness in reviewing transactions, quicker decision making than human experts, greater security than an expert employee who may leave the company for a competitor, capture and documentation of scarce expertise, etc. (as taught by Qureshi: ¶ 38).

Regarding claim 11, Webhire does not expressly teach that the job opening description comprises an extensible markup language (XML) data stream; however, Official Notice is taken that it is old and well-known in the art of web-based programming to encode web sites that pull information from databases using XML since XML provides the benefit of more efficient dynamic content management. Since Webhire is implement over the Internet and manages job posting information (which tends to be very dynamic in nature), the Examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the Webhire-Callan-Qureshi combination's job opening description to comprise an extensible markup language (XML) data stream in order to facilitate more efficient management of the dynamic content.

[Claims 23, 25]   Claims 23 and 25 recite limitations already addressed by the rejection of claims 1, 3-7, 10-14, and 16-22 above; therefore, the same rejection applies. Furthermore, as per claim 23, while neither Webhire nor Callan nor Qureshi expressly teaches that a search query is parsed before the search is run, Official Notice is taken that it is old and well-known in the art of database management to run searches off of a parsed query. This search strategy facilitates natural language-based searching, which is easier for many people to use since many users find it more intuitive than creating structured queries (especially if the users do not have much programming knowledge). Therefore, the Examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the Webhire-Callan-Qureshi combination to incorporate a job opening description parser module that is configured to parse the job opening description to obtain at least one job post site selection criterion in order to provide users with an interface that is more intuitive than creating structured queries (especially if the users do not have much programming knowledge).

Regarding claim 25, conversion of data into a proper format for a given website is inherent to Internet communications and web site generation; therefore, the recited conversion functionality is addressed by the Webhire-Callan-Qureshi combination.

[Claims 26, 28-32]   Claims 26 and 28-32 recite limitations already addressed by the rejection of claims 1 and 3-7 above; therefore, the same rejection applies.

[Claims 35-39, 41-47]   Claims 35-39 and 41-47 recite limitations already addressed

by the rejection of claims 10-14 and 16-22 above; therefore, the same rejection applies.

[Claims 48, 50-54]   Claims 48 and 50-54 recite limitations already addressed by the

rejection of claims 1 and 3-7 above; therefore, the same rejection applies.

[Claims 57-61, 63-67]   Claims 57-61 and 63-67 recite limitations already addressed

by the rejection of claims 10-14 and 16-22 above; therefore, the same rejection applies.

Allowable Subject Matter

5.   Claims 8, 9, 33, 34, 55, and 56 are objected to as being dependent upon a

rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all

of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject

matter: The closest prior art of record is Webhire (as disclosed in "Webhire Links

Corporate Recruiting Desktops to Over 2,000 Job Posting Sites") in view of Callan et al.

("Searching Distributed Collections With Inference Networks") and further in view of

Qureshi et al. ("Artificial Intelligence in Accounting and Business"). The combination of

these references addresses a system/method for ranking the best job sites for posting

job opportunities. The job sites can be ranked based on geographic location, skill set,

and job post site performance using an inference engine with a fact table. However,

neither of these references expressly teaches or suggests the ranking of these job sites

by "computing, for each respective job post site in the geographic location and job post

site performance ranked list of job post sites and the skill set and job post site

performance ranked list of job post sites, a weighted average using ranks assigned to

the respective job post site in the geographic location and job post site performance

ranked list of job post sites and the skill set and job post site performance ranked list of

job post sites" (which is recited in claims 8, 33, and 55); therefore, claims 8, 33, and 55

are deemed to be allowable over the prior art of record. Similarly, neither of these

references expressly teaches or suggests the ranking of these job sites by "computing,

for each respective job post site in the geographic location and job post site

performance ranked list of job post sites and the skill set and job post site performance

ranked list of job post sites, an average using ranks assigned to the respective job post

site in the geographic location and job post site performance ranked list of job post sites

and the skill set and job post site performance ranked list of job post sites" (which is

recited in claims 9, 34, and 56); therefore, claims 9, 34, and 56 are deemed to be

allowable over the prior art of record.

Conclusion

6.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Susanna M. Diaz whose telephone number is (571) 272-

6733. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 10 am - 6 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (571) 272-6729. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Susanna M. Diaz
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3623

August 2, 2006